

***2006 Secretary's
Robert W. Carey
Performance Excellence
Program***



***Judge's
Desk Guide***

Contents

	Page
Overview of the Robert W. Carey Performance Excellence Program	3
Program Process and Timeline.....	5
Summary of Key Changes for 2006	7
Carey Program Judge Qualifications and Other Requirements	8
Key Responsibilities of a Carey Judge	9
Contact Information	10
Appendix	
Initial Review Sheets	11
Final Review Sheets	14

Overview of the Robert W. Carey Performance Excellence Program

The annual Secretary's of Veterans Affairs Robert W. Carey Performance Excellence Awards were established to recognize organizations that have implemented exemplary approaches to systems management. The Award:

- Promotes systems management awareness and implementation throughout the Department.
- Provides a model against which organizations can measure performance compared to public and private sector organizations.
- Inspires organizations and individuals to do seek opportunities for continuous improvement.
- Support VA Strategic Goals:
 1. Restore the capability of veterans with disabilities to the greatest extent possible, and improve the quality of their lives and that of their families.
 2. Ensure a smooth transition for veterans from active military service to civilian life.
 3. Honor and serve veterans in life and memorialize them in death for their sacrifices on behalf of the Nation.
 4. Contribute to the public health, emergency management, socioeconomic well-being, and history of the Nation.
 5. Deliver world-class service to veterans and their families by applying sound business principles that result in effective management of people, communications, technology, and governance.

The **Robert W. Carey Performance Excellence Award** uses the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award criteria as a foundation. Recognition recommendations made to the Secretary are based on performance level. Performance scores assigned are consistent with scores that would be given through the Baldrige award program.

The award is named in memory of Robert W. Carey, a publicly recognized VA quality leader and a champion for excellence in the Federal Government. Mr. Carey was the Director of the Philadelphia Regional Office and Insurance Center from 1985 until 1990.

DRAFT

Awards are presented for multiple levels of recognition.

- Certificates of Commitment are given to organizations that demonstrate systematic approaches and are transitioning from problem solving to a general improvement orientation.
- Achievement awards will be presented to organizations that demonstrate effective, systematic approaches to management and have some positive trends and performance levels in key areas of importance.
- Excellence awards will be presented to organizations that demonstrate effective, systematic approaches to management, initiate refinements to continuously improve processes, and show positive trends and results in many key areas.
- Trophy awards will be presented to organizations that demonstrate systematic approaches to management, initiate refinements to continuously improve processes, and show good performance levels and trends in most areas of importance. A maximum of two Trophies will be awarded in any given year.
- Circle of Excellence (COE) awards will be presented to recent trophy level winners that are not yet eligible to compete for the trophy and have demonstrated performance levels equal to, or higher than, trophy level expectations. There is no limit to the number of COE awards each year.

Trophy recipient(s) receive a custom-designed, cut-crystal trophy. Circle of Excellence winners receive an elegant encased award that identifies each year of recognition until that organization is eligible to compete for the trophy again. Excellence Award winners receive an elegant encased award. Achievement Award winners receive an engraved plaque. At the annual awards ceremony, held in fall, the Secretary will present these awards. VA showcases award winners throughout the year.

Applicants qualifying for a Certificate of Commitment receive recognition with their feedback report.

Program Process and Timeline

The key milestones for the 2006 Carey Program Cycle are:

(Note: Carey Program Judge milestones are in bold print.)

- December 2005
 - **2006 Carey Judge Selection Begins**
 - Program timeline communicated to potential applicants
 - 2006 Carey/Baldrige Criteria available
- January 2006
 - Notice sent to potential examiners
- April 2006
 - New examiners trained
- May 2006
 - Experienced examiners trained
 - Examiners assigned to teams
 - Examiners receive examination packages
 - Examiners begin initial independent review
- June 2006
 - Examination in Washington D.C.
 - Session I, June 5 -9
 - Session I, June 12 - 16
 - Applicants notified of status (Site Visit or No Site Visit)
 - **Selected applicant packages sent to judges for review**
 - Arrangements made for site visits
 - **Carey program office and teams receive judge's feedback**
- July 2006
 - Site visits begin
 - Feedback to applicants not receiving site visits
- August 2006
 - Complete site visits
 - **Judges receive package(s) of potential trophy winners**
 - Feedback reports sent to finalists which were not forwarded to judges for a second review.
- September 2006
 - **Judges consensus call (potential trophy winners)**
 - **Judges consensus calls (Circle of Excellence applicants)**

Note: Two or more judges will be selected to review top two (potential trophy winners) application packages. Two judges will be assigned up to two Circle of Excellence

DRAFT

packages to review. One judge will be identified as lead for each consensus session. Judges will not be assigned more than two packages to review for consensus.

- October 2006
 - Feedback reports to remaining applicants
 - Secretary selects winners
- November 2006
 - Annual awards and symposium in Washington DC
 - **Provide input to improve the program in the following cycle**

Summary of Key Changes For 2006

Area of Change	2005	2006
Judge's Qualifications	Minimum of three years experience as a NIST Baldrige examiner	Minimum of 4 four years experience as a NIST Baldrige examiner
Timeline	Initial judge review in <u>May</u> . Final judge review end of <u>July</u> .	Initial judge review in <u>June</u> . Final judge review in <u>September</u> .
Judges "final" review	Final review is a consensus review focused on score and comments.	Final review is a consensus review of score, key themes, strengths, OFIs, and Best Practices.
Judges final work product for standard Carey Program	A consensus worksheet that validates/revises comments and scores.	<u>Product</u> A consensus worksheet that validates/revises scores A sheet highlighting key themes, strengths, opportunities, and Best Practices. A sheet indicating the relative strength of the top to applicants.
Judges final work product for COE applicants	Worksheet that validates/revises comments and scores.	<u>Product</u> A consensus worksheet that validates/revises scores A sheet highlighting key themes, strengths, opportunities, and Best Practices.
Time Commitment	40 – 50 hours	50 – 60 hours
<p>* VHA Kizer Award program applicants will participate in the Carey program. Those applicants will be eligible for both awards. Carey/Kizer packages qualifying for possible recognition will be sent to both (Carey and Kizer) judges for review. This includes the initial and final consensus reviews. The process should be transparent for Carey judges. On the rare chance that judges disagree on general score band or a significant finding then the Carey Program Manager will arrange a brief conference call. Such calls will have a maximum duration of 30 minutes.</p>		

Carey Program Judge Qualifications and Other Requirements

Qualifications:

Individuals being considered to serve as a Carey Program Judge must have:

- A minimum of four years experience as a NIST Baldrige Examiner
- Current working knowledge of the Baldrige Performance Excellence Criteria.

Time Commitment:

- Carey judges commit to serve for one complete program cycle (approximately 10 months). A judge may agree to serve, if asked, for up to three consecutive years.
- Work time is estimated to be 50 – 60 hours. This estimate is based on feedback from previous Program Judges.

Work Products

- Review sheets for two application packages (initial review). This is a key input for teams to educate them on interpretation and application of excellence criteria. The review of scoring is a critical step in reducing scoring variation across applicant teams. Score is a key factor in determining recognition level.
- Review sheets for two consensus packages (final review). This is a final chance to validate score. Score is considered when determining recognition level. Score is also critical because many applicants apply to Baldrige and various State Quality Award programs. The scores received through the Carey process provides these applicants with objective performance information before making the decision to apply for external recognition. Validation of strengths and OFIs provides applicants with meaningful information for improvement. Key themes and Best Practices provide the Department with key sharing opportunities.

Needed Documentation:

Carey Program Judges must provide the Carey Program Manager with the following:

- A one-page resume indicating at least four years experience as a NIST Baldrige examiner and other relevant experience with the Performance Excellence Criteria.
- Mailing address (No post office box number)
- Fax number
- E-mail address
- Telephone number

Key Responsibilities of a Carey Judge

A Carey judge is a respected subject-matter-expert who serves to ensure valid, objective, assessments of performance relative to the current Baldrige criteria are conducted. Key responsibilities include:

- Evaluation of applicant packages to validate and calibrate the work of Carey examination teams.
- Notifying the Carey Program Manager of any real or perceived conflicts of interest with evaluation of a Carey application.
- Discuss applicant information **only** with Carey program officials and other judges, as appropriate.
- Provide products to the Carey Program Office timely.
- Identify possible program improvements as needed during the award cycle and at the end of the cycle.

If there are any questions regarding the responsibilities of a judge, please call the Carey Program Manager for clarification.

Contact Information

Carey Program

Address:

Office of Policy, Planning, and Preparedness 008B3
Department of Veterans Affairs
810 Vermont Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20420

Fax number: (202) 273-5991

Carey Program Manager
Eric J. Malloy
(202) 273-5585
eric.malloy@va.gov

Carey Program Analyst
Pamela Ribovick
(202) 273-5285
Pamela.Ribovick@va.gov

Carey Program Analyst
Gwen Young
(202) 273-5038
gwendolyn.young@va.gov

Director, Management Systems Improvement Service 008B3
Scott Holliday
(202) 273-5053
scott.holliday@va.gov

Appendix

Initial Review Sheets

Description:

The Carey Program Manager and Administration Co-Chairs review all applications, draft feedback reports, and scores. Based on this review applications are selected for external review.

Each judge receives one or two packages for the initial review. Judges have 2 – 3 weeks to perform their review. Information from the initial review is used by the Carey Program Manager and the examination teams in preparation for site visits. Judge's comments are particularly useful in identifying data collection needs and additional clarification issues for the site visit. Teams will be required to address all issues identified by judges during site visit. For each Item reviewed, if a judge determines that the initial team score is off by more than 10% then that judge has the authority to change the score.

JUDGE WORKSHEET – INITIAL REVIEW

Sample Form and Instructions

Name Applicant Organization
ABC organization

Date: xx/xx/xxx

Instructions:

- Review Applicant Package (application, initial feedback report, initial score) and Carey criteria.
- Reread the first Item and the corresponding feedback and score.
- Determine the scoring band that “you” would place the applicant in.
- Record the appropriate score band in the “Judge Score Band” column.
- If the examination team's initial score was more than 10 percentage points away from the band you selected then provide a brief explanation in judge's corresponding comment box.
- If there are site issues or questions that would benefit the team when conducting a site visit please include comments, questions, etc. in the same judge's comment box.
- Do not comment or record any information in the “**INITIAL SITE SCORE**” or “**FINAL SITE SCORE**” columns.
- Repeat steps for each Item.

DRAFT

(Sample)

<i>Item Name</i>	<i>Item Number</i>	<i>Initial Team Score</i>	<i>Judge Score Band</i>	<i>INITIAL SITE SCORE</i>	<i>FINAL SITE SCORE</i>
Leadership					
Organizational Leadership	1.1	70	70% - 85%		
Judges Comments Application, feedback comments, and score are reasonable at this point in the process.					
Social Responsibility	1.2	69	50% - 65%		
Judges Comments Application, feedback comments, and score are reasonable at this point in the process. However, examiners have not identified any OFIs for this Item. Validate targets and measures for regulatory requirements, ethics, and community support.					
Strategic Planning					
Strategy Development	2.1	69	50% - 65%		
Judges Comments While I agree with the scoring band, I would score this section near the middle of the band rather than the top. Potential OFI: It is not clear how the applicant's many stakeholders and partnerships provide input or play a role in forming strategic directions.					
Strategy Deployment	2.2	60	30% - 45%		
Judges Comments Key changes in customers and markets are not described. It is not clear how measures presented will manage cost, schedule, and performance of action plans. I would place this Item in a lower scoring band.					
Customer and Market Focus					
Customer and Market Knowledge	3.1				
Judges Comments					
Customer Relationships and Satisfaction	3.2				
Judges Comments					
Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge					
Measurement and Analysis of Organizational Performance	4.1				
Judges Comments					
Information and Knowledge	4.2				

DRAFT

<i>Item Name</i>	<i>Item Number</i>	<i>Initial Team Score</i>	<i>Judge Score Band</i>	<i>INITIAL SITE SCORE</i>	<i>FINAL SITE SCORE</i>
Management					
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Human Resource Focus					
Work Systems	5.1				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Employee Learning and Motivation	5.2				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Employee Well-Being and Satisfaction	5.3				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Process Management					
Value Creation Processes	6.1				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Support Processes	6.2				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Business Results					
Customer Focused	7.1				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Product/Service	7.2				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Financial/Market	7.3				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Human Resource	7.4				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Organizational Effectiveness	7.5				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Governance and Social Responsibility	7.6				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					

Appendix

Final Review Sheets

Description:

After site visits have been completed the Carey Program Manager will send applicant packages to teams of judges for a second review. Judges may receive up to 3 packages. Most judges will receive two packages for the second review. These may be regular applicant packages (pulled from the pool of applicants that had the initial judge review) or Circle of Excellence (COE) applicant packages. COE applicants are recent top Carey winners that are not yet eligible to compete again for the Carey trophy. These packages are reviewed by select examiners using a more rigorous examination process. These packages are not considered during the initial judge review.

All packages for final review will consist of the application, post site visit feedback report and score, additional site visit information. The Carey Program Manager will ask selected judges to lead consensus discussions of finalist packages.

The final review has three phases. First, judges conduct an independent review using the final review form. Second, the lead judge shares key factors, themes, and leads in a consensus discussion. Finally, the lead judge sends one final consensus package back to the Carey Program Manager.

Information from the final consensus review is used as a basis for finalizing the feedback report and scores associated with each top finalist. Comments provided are used by the Program Manager and incorporated into feedback reports. Judges comments on topics such as Best Practices may also be forwarded to the Secretary's for consideration during the final award selections.

JUDGE WORKSHEET – FINAL REVIEW

Sample Form and Instructions

Name Applicant Organization
ABC Organization

Date: xx/xx/xxxx

Lead – Judge “X” (The Carey Program Manager will call judges and ask them to lead their team of 2 or 3 judges in the final review.)

Instructions:

- Independent Review
- Review Finalist Package (application, feedback report, final site scores, site findings)
- For Each Item review:
 - Application
 - Draft final feedback report including site comments and judge's comments.
 - Final site score

DRAFT

- If the team final score is consistent with a score that you believe is accurate place an “X” in the judges “concur” column. Consistent with a score that you believe is accurate means a score that is no more than 10% points higher or lower than actual.
- If the team final score is more than 10% points higher or lower than a score you believe to be accurate then identify an appropriate score. Place the appropriate score in the column entitled “Revised Score” and place a brief comment explaining why in the “Judges Comments” column.
- Team Consensus
- Share analysis with other judges reviewing the same package (e-mail is recommended).
- The lead judge will create a consensus worksheet. This worksheet will aggregate comments from judges participating in the final review.
- The Lead Judge will also develop a power point (or similar package) file containing:
 - Key Factors (most important key factors for the applicant)
 - Key Themes – summary of key strengths
 - Key Themes – summary of key vulnerabilities
 - Scoring profile – provided to lead judge by the Carey Program Office showing consensus and site visit scores
 - A page or slide four questions this is not quite clear. Are you asking that four slides be developed to answer each of these questions or that the judges just create slides to answer these questions??
 - Q1 Is this a role model facility?
 - Q2 Three things this applicant could teach others (++)
 - Q3 Are there one or two things that would be (--) for this facility?
 - Q4 If team of judges are reviewing two packages – is there a significant difference (may help to define significant difference) in the performance of the applicants or is the score difference due to rater variation?
- The Carey Program Manager will arrange a conference call. (The lead judge contacts the Carey Program Manager to request the conference call.*)
- The Lead Judge is responsible for sending one, “Judge Worksheet – Final Review” and a “Judges Consensus Summary” to the Carey Program Manager, Eric J. Malloy at eric.malloy@va.gov . Individual judge review sheets are not required.

Judges should keep their materials until the end of November. There may be a follow-up conference call or questions for the lead judge. At the end of November judges **must** destroy all applicant related materials.

DRAFT

Applicant: “XXX” (Sample)

<i>Item Name</i>	<i>Item Number</i>	<i>Team Final % Score</i>	<i>Judge Concur</i>	<i>Final Score</i>	
Leadership					
Organizational Leadership	1.1	54	Yes	54	
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Social Responsibility	1.2	69	Yes	69	
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Strategic Planning					
Strategy Development	2.1	49	Yes	49	
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Strategy Deployment	2.2	55	Yes	55	
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Customer and Market Focus					
Customer/Market	3.1	69	No	50	
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
The team feedback as written, supports the team score reasonably well. However the single OFI is significant and this does not appear to be a mature systematic approach. This one is more than 10 points off. Judges agree that 50 is reasonable based on information provided.					
Customer Relationships and Satisfaction	3.2				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Measurement, Analysis, and Knowledge					
Measurement and Analysis of Organizational Performance	4.1				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Information and Knowledge Management	4.2				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Human Resource Focus					
Work Systems	5.1				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Employee Learning and Motivation	5.2				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Employee Well-Being and Satisfaction	5.3				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Process Management					
Value Creation Processes	6.1				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					

DRAFT

<i>Item Name</i>	<i>Item Number</i>	<i>Team Final % Score</i>	<i>Judge Concur</i>	<i>Final Score</i>	
Support Processes	6.2				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Business Results					
Customer Focused	7.1				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Product/Service	7.2				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Financial/Market	7.3				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Human Resource	7.4				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Organizational Effectiveness	7.5				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					
Governance and Social Responsibility	7.6				
<i>Judges Comments</i>					

Judges Summary Sheet (Sample)

Key Factors (most important key factors for the applicant)

Key Themes – summary of key strengths

Key Themes – summary of key vulnerabilities

Scoring profile – provided to lead judge by the Carey Program Office showing consensus and site visit scores

Q1 Is this a role model facility?

This is a role model facility. They have a sound, systematic approach to many areas of importance identified in the criteria. There is evidence of deployment and cycle of refinement. This facility appears to have innovative approaches that would benefit other VA and private sector organizations.

Q2 Three things this applicant could teach others (++)

- Weekly – meet with the director session between the director and one employee selected at random is effective at increasing employee moral, leadership understanding, and employee involvement.
- Partner participation in annual planning process has greatly improved the level of transparency of service to veterans.
- Quarterly virtual best practices sharing sessions is highly effective.

Q3 Are there one or two things that would be (--) for this facility?

This applicant has made little progress in the areas of employee involvement and segmentation.

Q4 If team of judges are reviewing two packages – is there a significant difference in the performance of the applicants or is the score difference due to rater variation?

Based on a review of the two packages provided, the judges reached consensus that the difference in score between the two applicants reviewed is most likely due to rater variation. In other words, while Item level performance may vary between applicants, the overall performance of both is similar.